



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/016,862	12/13/2001	Shmuel Shaffer	062891.0665	5949
75	7590 09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
Baker Botts L.L.P. 2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600 Dallas, TX 75201-2980			AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2642	
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	o. Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Commence	10/016,862	SHAFFER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi	2642				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTED TO THE	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 L	December 2001					
	is action is non-final.					
<u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-41</u> is/are pending in the application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 December 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/28/05. 	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				
	-,					

Application/Control Number: 10/016,862

Art Unit: 2642

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 11, 13-15, 17, 22, 24-26, 28, 32, 34-36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brooks et al (US PAT # 5,825,869).

Regarding claim 1, Brooks teaches a method for routing calls of an automatic call distributor system (see ACD system 10 in Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 51-53), comprising: receiving, from a user, a request for connection with <u>one</u> of plurality of agents (see agent telephones 30, 32, 34 in Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 51-67, col. 5, lines 45-54 and col. 8, lines 58-63) having <u>one</u> of plurality of skills (SKILLA, SKILLB, and SKILLC, see col. 9, lines 55-56); identifying at least <u>first and second agents</u> of the plurality of agents (see col. 11, lines 33-37), the first and second agents each having at least the one of the plurality of skills; the first and second agents being available for connection with user along first and second communication paths, respectively (col. 6, lines 18-19); receiving network information regarding each of the first and second communication paths (the network information reads on determining the availability of each agent, see col. 11, lines 33-43); identifying generally unique skill of the plurality of skills (reads on agent with "unique" skill C, see col. 9, lines 50-56); and routing the request along preferred

Application/Control Number: 10/016,862 Page 3

Art Unit: 2642

communication path of the first and second communication paths, the preferred communication path being selected to attain a higher probability that the generally unique skill will remain available for receiving a future request for connection (see col. 9, lines 50-65).

Claims 7, 11, 17, 22, 28, 32 and 38 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1. The claimed "port" as recited in claim 11 is inherent. The claimed "processor" reads on switch 26, see Fig. Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 3, 13, 24 and 34, Brooks teaches the plurality of skills comprise a plurality of languages spoken by <u>one or more</u> of the plurality of agents (see col. 4, lines 63-67. Also, this can read on one agent that has SKILLA, SKILLB, and SKILLC, the Skill can read on the language, see col. 9, lines 55-60).

Claims 4, 14, 25 and 35 limitations basically read on the type of businesses required such as product-related knowledge (see col. 4, lines 63-67 and col. 9, lines 18-23).

Claims 5, 15, 26, and 36 limitations read on the first agent being at home (see col. 1, lines 8-40).

Application/Control Number: 10/016,862 Page 4

Art Unit: 2642

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2, 8, 10, 12, 18, 20-21, 23, 29, 31, 33, 39 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Miloslavsky et al (US AT # 6, 879, 586).

Regarding claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 23, 29, 33, and 39, Brooks does not explicitly teach the network information regarding each the first second communication paths, respectively, comprises first and second quantities of <u>bandwidth</u> available along the first and second communication paths, respectively.

Art Unit: 2642

However, Miloslavsky teaches an Internet Protocol <u>call center</u> that contains high bandwidth ports and low bandwidth ports for establishing connection and processing customers' requests and demands (see col. 5, lines 4-13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize certain bandwidth ports to receive customers' requests in a call center, as taught by Miloslavsky, into the Brooks system in order to use a bandwidth that is sufficient for the need of the incoming call which improves the quality of communication between callers and agents.

Claims 10, 20, and 31 are rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 23, 29 and 33.

Regarding claims 21 and 41, the use of a different bandwidth ensures the voice quality as previously discussed in claims 2, 8, 12, 18, 23, 29, 33, and 39.

5. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19, 27, 30, 37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Kwan (US AT # 6, 728, 358).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 27 and 37, Brook does not specifically teach the network parameters being selected from the group consisting of delay, jitter and echo.

Application/Control Number: 10/016,862

Art Unit: 2642

However, Kwan teaches efficient buffer allocation for current and predictive participants in a voice conference call (see abstract). Kwan discusses how to minimize the loss of audio data and ensure that the delay, introduced by using the speaker's data that has been saved into their speaker buffer, is never more than the desired jitter buffer (see col. 3, lines 10-15). Kwan also teaches the use of "echo suppression" (col. 1, lines 62-67).

Page 6

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of parameters consisting of delay, jitter, and echo, as taught by Kwan into the Brooks system in order to enhance the quality of the system. The use of well-known techniques for improving the quality of the communication, as taught by Kwan, would have been obvious.

Regarding claims 9, 19, 30 and 40, Kwan is mainly concerned with the quality of voice that is received and delivered to the participants in a voice conference call (see col. 3, lines 1-15 and lines 33-37).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Judkins et al (US PAT # 6,763,104) teaches in a call center and based on customer needs and type of service, calls will be routed to the best available agent with the matching skills who can handle the customer needs (see col. 2, lines 1-17 and lines 33-53 also abstract of the invention).

Flockhart et al (US PAT # 6,088,441) teaches in a skill –based ACD, an available agent is reserved and assigned to handle calls needing a "rare" skill (see abstract).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F. Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 8

Examiner

Rasha S. Al-Aubaidi

Art Unit 2642

08/31/2005